

REMARKS

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); (3) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and/or (4) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claim 2 and amended claims 1, 3-10, 19 and 21 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1 and 3-25 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-8, 19-22, 24 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0041586 (Irube et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,672,820 (Rossi et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,824 (Berstis) and U.S. Patent No. 6,535,243 (Tullis). Claims 9, 11 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. in view of Rossi et al. and further in view of Berstis, Tullis, and U.S. Patent No. 6,516,094 (Takahashi et al.). Claims 5, 10 and 12-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. in view of Rossi and further in view of Berstis, Tullis, and U.S. Patent No. 6,236,940 (Rudow).

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 19-22, 24 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. in view of Rossi et al., Berstis and Tullis. Claim 2 has been canceled. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of these references in Applicant's previously filed responses and reasserts all arguments submitted in those responses. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, the Examiner asserts that Irube et al. discloses a camera module for performing converting operation between analog image data and digital image data, in Figure 1, items 4 and 25. However, these portions merely disclose a camera unit and camera interface unit where the camera unit 4 is detachable from the terminal main body 1, and the camera unit 25 is a part of the terminal main body 1. This is not a camera module connected to a camera installed within the mobile terminal, as recited in the claims of the present application. Irube et al. discloses a camera that is detachable from the terminal main body (see, column 3, paragraph 47). Camera 4 in Irube et al. is not installed within the terminal main body.

The Examiner admits that Irube et al. does not disclose or suggest a direction sensor for detecting a compass orientation direction of a photographing object but states that Irube et al. discloses a camera direction sensor unit in Figure 1, item 28, and also asserts disclosure in Rossi at column 4, lines 1-46, and disclosure in Berstis at column 1, lines 47-53. However, as has been

noted in Applicant's previously filed responses, Irube et al. merely discloses a camera direction sensing unit that detects the presence/absence of the attached camera unit 4. Further, the asserted portions of Rossi merely disclose that the computer accepts the latitude, longitude and altitude of the airborne segment and the heading and depression angles of the pointing device and computes the location of the object being viewed. Further, Berstis merely discloses that it is currently cost prohibitive to incorporate a GPS receiver into every portable electronic device for which position and time information could be useful. This is not a direction sensor configured to detect compass orientation direction data associated with an image located in a photographing direction of the camera, as recited in the claims of the present application. None of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose or suggest these limitations. None of the cited references disclose or suggest an image located in a photographing direction of the camera or a direction sensor configured to detect compass orientation direction data associated with the image. Rossi merely discloses providing map location coordinates of an object being pointed at by a pointing device where the map location coordinates include latitude, longitude and altitude. This is not compass orientation data direction, as recited in the claims of the present application. Whereas Rossi et al. discloses map location data, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to compass orientation direction data (e.g., whereby direction of sunlight at different times of day may be determined). Compass data and map location (latitude, longitude and altitude) data are not the same.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 6-8, 19-22 and 24-25, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 19 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 19-22 and 24-25 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn at that these claims be allowed.

Claims 9, 11 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al., Rossi et al., Berstis, Tullis and further in view of Takahashi et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 10 and 19 and, therefore, are patentable over the cited references at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 9, 11 and 23 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 5, 10 and 12-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. in view of Rossi et al., Berstis, Tullis and further in view of Rudow et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claim 10, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of

this claim of, *inter alia*, displaying the separated image and compass orientation direction data on a screen of a display of the mobile terminal, wherein the compass orientation data is displayed within the image on the screen of the display, the compass orientation data being associated with a direction of the image, the image being located in a photographing direction of a camera. As noted previously, neither Irube et al., nor Rossi et al. nor Berstis disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Further, neither Tullis nor Rudow et al. overcome the deficiencies of the other cited references.

Regarding claims 5 and 12-18, Applicant submits that claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 10 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 5, 10 and 12-18 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 3-25 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck
Registration No. 40,287
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/CLD:tlg:jlg

Date: December 29, 2006

Q:\Documents\2000-244\108618

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610